arXiv:1510.08211v1 [math.RA] 28 Oct 2015

On commuting probability of finite rings

Jutirekha Dutta, Dhiren Kumar Basnet and Rajat Kanti Nath*

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tezpur University, Napaam-784028, Sonitpur, Assam, India.
Emails: jutirekhadutta@yahoo.com, dbasnet@tezu.ernet.in and rajatkantinath@yahoo.com

Abstract

The commuting probability of a finite ring R, denoted by $\Pr(R)$, is the probability that any two randomly chosen elements of R commute. In this paper, we obtain several bounds for $\Pr(R)$ through a generalization of $\Pr(R)$. Further, we define $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of rings and show that the generalized commuting probability, defined in this paper, is invariant under $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of finite rings.

Key words: finite ring, commuting probability, isoclinism of rings.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16U70, 16U80.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper S denotes a subring of a finite ring R. We define $Z(S,R) = \{s \in S : sr = rs \ \forall \ r \in R\}$. Note that $Z(R,R) = Z(R)$, the center of R, and $Z(S,R) = Z(R) \cap S$. For any two elements s and r of a ring R, we write $[s,r]$ to denote the additive commutator of s and r. That

*Corresponding author

is, $[s,r] = sr - rs$. By $K(S,R)$ we denote the set $\{[s,r] : s \in S, r \in R\}$ and $[S,R]$ denotes the subgroup of $(R,+)$ generated by $K(S,R)$. Note that $[R,R]$ is the commutator subgroup of $(R,+)$ (see [2]). Also, for any $x \in R$, we write $[x,R]$ to denote the subgroup of $(R,+)$ consisting of all elements of the form $[x,y]$ where $y \in R$.

The commuting probability of R, denoted by $\Pr(R)$, is the probability that a randomly chosen pair of elements of R commute. That is

$$\Pr(R) = \frac{|\{(s,r) \in R \times R : sr = rs\}|}{|R \times R|}.$$

The study of commuting probability of a finite ring was initiated by MacHale [11] in the year 1976. Many papers have been written on commuting probability of finite groups in the last few decades, for example see [3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15] starting from the works of Erdös and Turán [5]. However, the study of the commuting probability of a finite ring was neglected. After many years, in the year 2013, MacHale resumes the study of commuting probability of finite rings together with Buckley and Ní Shé (see [1, 2]). In this paper, we obtain several bounds for $\Pr(R)$ through a generalization of $\Pr(R)$. Motivated by [6, 17, 4] and [14], we generalize $\Pr(R)$ as the following ratio

$$\Pr(S,R) = \frac{|\{(s,r) \in S \times R : sr = rs\}|}{|S \times R|} \tag{1.1}$$

where S is a subring of a finite ring R. Note that $\Pr(S,R)$ is the probability that a randomly chosen pair of elements, one from the subring S and the other from R, commute. We call $\Pr(S,R)$ the relative commuting probability of the subring S in the ring R. It is clear that $\Pr(R,R) = \Pr(R)$ and $\Pr(S,R) = 1$ if and only if $Z(S,R) = S$. In Section 3 of this paper, we define $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of rings and show that $\Pr(S_1,R_1) = \Pr(S_2,R_2)$ if (S_1,R_1) is $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic to (S_2,R_2) where S_1 and S_2 are subrings of the rings R_1 and R_2 respectively.

In this paper, we write R/S or $\frac{R}{S}$ to denote the additive quotient group, for any subring S of R, and $|R:S|$ to denote the index of $(S,+)$ in $(R,+)$. Further, if S is an ideal of R then we also write R/S or $\frac{R}{S}$ to denote the quotient ring. The isomorphisms considered are the additive group isomorphisms. We shall also use the fact that for any non-commutative ring R, the additive group $\frac{R}{Z(R)}$ is not a cyclic group (see [11, Lemma 1]).

2 Some bounds

Let S be a subring of a ring R and $r \in R$. We define a subring of S given by $C_S(r) = \{s \in S : sr = rs\}$. Then, from (1.1), it follows that

$$\Pr(S, R) = \frac{1}{|S||R|}\sum_{s\in S}|C_R(s)| = \frac{1}{|S||R|}\sum_{r\in R}|C_S(r)|. \tag{2.1}$$

We also have the following lemma, which gives a relation between $|S : C_S(r)|$ and $|R : C_R(r)|$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let S be a subring of a ring R and $r \in R$. Then*

$$|S : C_S(r)| \leq |R : C_R(r)|.$$

The equality holds if and only if $S + C_R(r) = R$.

Proof. Let r be any element of R. We know that $S+C_R(r) \subseteq R$, which gives $\frac{|S||C_R(r)|}{|S\cap C_R(r)|} \leq |R|$. Therefore, $\frac{|S||C_R(r)|}{|C_S(r)|} \leq |R|$ and hence the lemma follows.

For equality, it is sufficient to note that $|S : C_S(r)| = |R : C_R(r)|$ if and only if $|S + C_R(r)| = |R|$. □

Above lemma plays an important role in finding bounds for $\Pr(S, R)$ and hence for $\Pr(R)$. We begin with the following result which is an improvement of [11, Theorem 4].

Theorem 2.2. *Let S be a subring of a ring R. Then*

$$\Pr(R) \leq \Pr(S, R) \leq \Pr(S).$$

Proof. By (2.1) and Lemma 2.1, We have

$$\Pr(S, R) = \frac{1}{|S||R|}\sum_{r\in R}|C_S(r)| \geq \frac{1}{|R||R|}\sum_{r\in R}|C_R(r)| = \Pr(R)$$

and

$$\Pr(S, R) = \frac{1}{|S||R|}\sum_{s\in S}|C_R(s)| \leq \frac{1}{|S||S|}\sum_{s\in S}|C_S(s)| = \Pr(S).$$

Hence the theorem follows. □

Corollary 2.3. *Let S be a subring of a ring R. Then*

(i) $\Pr(S,R) = \Pr(R)$ *if and only if* $S + C_R(r) = R$ *for all* $r \in R$.

(ii) $\Pr(S,R) = \Pr(S)$ *if and only if* $S + C_R(r) = R$ *for all* $r \in S$.

Proof. It is sufficient to note that equalities hold in Theorem 2.2 if and only if the equality holds in Lemma 2.1. □

We remark that $\Pr(S,R) = \Pr(R)$ implies $\Pr(S,R) = \Pr(S)$; but the converse is not true, since for a non-commutative ring R and any subring $S \subseteq Z(R)$ we have $\Pr(S) = \Pr(S,R) = 1$. But $\Pr(R) \neq \Pr(S,R)$. There exist finite rings and subrings such that the inequalities in Theorem 2.2 are strict. For example, consider the ring $R = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$ and its subring $S = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & a \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : a \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$. We have $\Pr(R) = \frac{5}{8}, \Pr(S,R) = \frac{3}{4}$ and $\Pr(S) = 1$. Hence, $\Pr(R) < \Pr(S,R) < \Pr(S)$.

Further, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.4. *Let* S_1 *and* S_2 *be two subrings of a ring* R *such that* $S_1 \subseteq S_2$. *Then* $\Pr(S_2,R) \leq \Pr(S_1,R) \leq \Pr(S_1,S_2)$.

Proof. Since $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq R$ we have, by Lemma 2.1,

$$|S_1 : C_{S_1}(r)| \leq |S_2 : C_{S_2}(r)| \leq |R : C_R(r)| \; \forall \; r \in R.$$

Thus

$$\Pr(S_1,S_2) = \frac{1}{|S_1||S_2|} \sum_{s \in S_1} |C_{S_2}(s)| \geq \frac{1}{|S_1|} \sum_{s \in S_1} \frac{|C_{S_2}(s)|}{|R|} = \Pr(S_1,R).$$

Also

$$\Pr(S_1,R) = \frac{1}{|S_1||R|} \sum_{s \in R} |C_{S_1}(s)| \geq \frac{1}{|R|} \sum_{s \in R} \frac{|C_{S_2}(s)|}{|S_2|} = \Pr(S_2,R).$$

Hence the theorem follows. □

Notice that $\Pr(R) \leq \Pr(S_2,R)$ and $\Pr(S_1,S_2) \leq \Pr(S_1)$. Therefore, the bounds obtained in Theorem 2.4 is a refinement of the bounds obtained in Theorem 2.2.

Let $\mathcal{R}_p$ denote the set of all finite rings having p as the smallest prime dividing their orders. The next few results give bounds for $\Pr(S,R)$, where S is a subring of a ring R and R is a ring in $\mathcal{R}_p$.

Theorem 2.5. *If $R \in \mathcal{R}_p$ and S is a subring of R. Then*

$$\frac{|Z(S,R)|}{|S|} + \frac{p(|S| - |Z(S,R)|)}{|S||R|} \leq \Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{(p-1)|Z(S,R)| + |S|}{p|S|}.$$

Proof. We know that

$$|S||R| \Pr(S,R) = |R||Z(S,R)| + \sum_{s \in S - Z(S,R)} |C_R(s)|. \tag{2.2}$$

If $s \notin Z(S,R)$ then $p \leq |C_R(s)| \leq \frac{|R|}{p}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{s \in S - Z(S,R)} p \leq \sum_{s \in S - Z(S,R)} |C_R(s)| \leq \sum_{s \in S - Z(S,R)} \frac{|R|}{p}. \tag{2.3}$$

Hence, the result follows from (2.2) and (2.3). □

Putting $S = R$, in Theorem 2.5, we get the following bounds for $\Pr(R)$.

Corollary 2.6. *If $R \in \mathcal{R}_p$ and S is a subring of R. Then*

$$\frac{|Z(R)|}{|R|} + \frac{p(|R| - |Z(R)|)}{|R|^2} \leq \Pr(R) \leq \frac{(p-1)|Z(R)| + |R|}{p|R|}.$$

If R is a non-commutative ring and p the smallest prime dividing $|R|$ then, by Theorem 2 of [11], we have $\Pr(R) \leq \frac{p^2+p-1}{p^3}$. For such ring R we have $|R : Z(R)| \geq p^2$ and so

$$\frac{(p-1)|Z(R)| + |R|}{p|R|} \leq \frac{p^2 + p - 1}{p^3}.$$

Thus the upper bound obtained in Corollary 2.6 is better than the upper bound obtained in Theorem 2 of [11].

We also have the following bounds for $\Pr(S,R)$.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $R \in \mathcal{R}_p$ and S be a subring of R.*

(i) *If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ and S is commutative, then $\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{2p-1}{p^2}$.*

(ii) *If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ and S is non-commutative, then $\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{p^2+p-1}{p^3}$.*

Proof. (i) If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ then $|Z(S,R)| \leq \frac{|S|}{p}$. Hence, using Theorem 2.5, we have

$$\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{(p-1)|Z(S,R)| + |S|}{p|S|} \leq \frac{(p-1)|S| + p|S|}{p^2|S|} = \frac{2p-1}{p^2}.$$

(ii) If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ then $\Pr(S,R) \neq 1$. Also, by Theorem 2.2, we have $\Pr(S,R) \leq \Pr(S)$. Since S is non-commutative and p is the smallest prime dividing $|S|$, the result follows from Theorem 2 of [11]. □

In particular, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.8. *Let R be any finite non-commutative ring and S a subring of R.*

(i) *If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ and S is commutative, then $\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{3}{4}$.*

(ii) *If $S \nsubseteq Z(R)$ and S is not commutative, then $\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{5}{8}$.*

The following two results characterize a subring S of a finite ring R such that $\Pr(S,R) = \frac{2p-1}{p^2}$ or $\frac{p^2+p-1}{p^3}$.

Theorem 2.9. *Let S be a commutative subring of a finite ring R such that $\Pr(S,R) = \frac{2p-1}{p^2}$, for some prime p. Then p divides $|R|$. Moreover, if p is the smallest prime dividing $|R|$ then*

$$\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p.$$

Proof. The first part follows from the definition of $\Pr(S,R)$. For the second part, using Theorem 2.5, we have $\Pr(S,R) \leq \frac{(p-1)|Z(S,R)|+|S|}{p|S|}$ and so $|S : Z(S,R)| \leq p$, as $\Pr(S,R) = \frac{2p-1}{p^2}$. If $|S : Z(S,R)| = 1$ then $\Pr(S,R) = 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence $|S : Z(S,R)| = p$ which gives $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p$. □

Theorem 2.10. *Let S be a non-commutative subring of a finite ring R such that $\Pr(S,R) = \frac{p^2+p-1}{p^3}$, for some prime p. Then p divides $|R|$. Moreover, if p is the smallest prime dividing $|R|$ then*

$$\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p.$$

Proof. The first part follows from the definition of $\Pr(S, R)$. For the second part, using Theorem 2.5, we have $\Pr(S, R) \leq \frac{(p-1)|Z(S,R)|+|S|}{p|S|}$ and so $|S : Z(S, R)| \leq p^2$, as $\Pr(S, R) = \frac{p^2+p-1}{p^3}$. Since S is not-commutative, $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)}$ is not cyclic. Therefore, $|S : Z(S, R)| \neq 1, p$. So, $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)}$ is a non-cyclic group of order p^2. Hence $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p$. □

In particular, for $p = 2$, we have the following results.

Corollary 2.11. *Let S be a subring of a finite ring R.*

(i) *If $\Pr(S, R) = \frac{3}{4}$ and S is commutative, then $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

(ii) *If $\Pr(S, R) = \frac{5}{8}$ and S is non-commutative, then $\frac{S}{Z(S,R)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$.*

In [11], MacHale listed five results regarding commuting probability of finite groups. The ring theoretic analogue of the first result of his list is proved in [2]. Here we prove the ring theoretic analogue of the last result. For this, we prove the ring theoretic analogue of [6, Theorem 3.9] from which the result follows. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.12. *Let H and N be two subrings of a non-commutative ring R such that N is an ideal of R and $N \subseteq H$. Then*

$$\frac{C_H(x) + N}{N} \subseteq C_{H/N}(x + N) \text{ for all } x \in R.$$

The equality holds if $N \cap [H, R] = \{0\}$.

Proof. For any element $s \in C_H(x) + N$, where $s = r + n$ for some $r \in C_H(x)$ and $n \in N$, we have $s + N = r + N \in \frac{H}{N}$. Also,

$$(s + N)(x + N) = rx + N = xr + N = (x + N)(s + N),$$

as $r \in C_H(x)$. This proves the first part.

Let $N \cap [H, R] = \{0\}$ and $y + N \in C_{H/N}(x + N)$. Then $y \in H$ and $(y + N)(x + N) = (x + N)(y + N)$. This gives $yx - xy \in N \cap [H, R] = \{0\}$ and so $y \in C_H(x)$. Therefore, $y+N \in \frac{C_H(x)+N}{N}$. Hence the equality holds. □

Theorem 2.13. *Let H and N be two subrings of a finite non-commutative ring R such that N is an ideal of R and $N \subseteq H$. Then*

$$\Pr(H, R) \leq \Pr\left(\frac{H}{N}, \frac{R}{N}\right) \Pr(N).$$

The equality holds if $N \cap [H, R] = \{0\}$.

Proof. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
|H||R|\Pr(H,R) =& \sum_{x\in R}|C_H(x)| \\
=& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}\sum_{y\in S}\frac{|C_H(y)|}{|N\cap C_H(y)|}|C_N(y)| \\
=& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}\sum_{y\in S}\frac{|C_H(y)+N|}{|N|}|C_N(y)| \\
\leq& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}\sum_{y\in S}|C_{\frac{H}{N}}(y+N)||C_N(y)| \quad \text{(using Lemma 2.12)} \\
=& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}|C_{\frac{H}{N}}(S)|\sum_{y\in S}|C_N(y)| \\
=& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}|C_{\frac{H}{N}}(S)|\sum_{n\in N}|C_R(n)\cap S|.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $a+N=S$ where $a\in R-N$. If $C_R(n)\cap S=\phi$ then $|C_R(n)\cap S|<|C_N(n)|$. If $C_R(n)\cap S\neq\phi$ then there exists $x_0\in C_R(n)\cap S$ such that $x_0=a+n_0$ for some $a\in R-N$ and $n_0\in N$. Therefore $x_0+N=a+N=S$ and so $S\cap C_R(n)=(x_0+N)\cap(x_0+C_R(n))=x_0+(N\cap C_R(n))=x_0+C_N(n)$. Hence $|S\cap C_R(n)|\leq|C_N(n)|$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
|H||R|\Pr(H,R) \leq& \sum_{S\in\frac{R}{N}}|C_{\frac{H}{N}}(S)|\sum_{n\in N}|C_N(n)| \\
=& \left|\frac{H}{N}\right|\left|\frac{R}{N}\right|\Pr\left(\frac{H}{N},\frac{R}{N}\right)|N|^2\Pr(N) \\
=& |H||R|\Pr\left(\frac{H}{N},\frac{R}{N}\right)\Pr(N).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the inequality follows.

Let $N\cap[H,R]=\{0\}$. Then, by Lemma 2.12, we have

$$\frac{C_H(x)+N}{N}=C_{H/N}(x+N) \text{ for all } x\in R.$$

If $S=a+N$ then it can be seen that $a+n\in C_R(n)\cap S$ for all $n\in N$. Therefore, $C_R(n)\cap S\neq\phi$ for all $n\in N$ and for all $S\in G/N$. Thus all the

inequalities above become equalities if $N \cap [H, R] = \{0\}$. This completes the proof. □

Putting $H = R$, in Theorem 2.13, we get the following corollary, which is analogous to the last result mentioned in [11].

Corollary 2.14. *Let R be a finite non-commutative ring and N be an ideal of R, then $\Pr(R) \leq \Pr(R/N)\Pr(N)$. The equality holds if $N \cap [R, R] = \{0\}$.*

The following lemma is useful in proving the next theorem.

Lemma 2.15 (Observation 2.1 [2])**.** *Let R be a finite ring. Then the additive group $R/C_R(x)$ is isomorphic to $[x, R]$ for all $x \in R$.*

Therefore, for all $s \in S$ we have

$$|[S, R]| \geq |K(S, R)| \geq |[s, R]| = |R : C_R(s)| \tag{2.4}$$

Theorem 2.16. *Let S be a subring of a finite ring R. Then*

$$\Pr(S, R) \geq \frac{1}{|K(S, R)|}\left(1 + \frac{|K(S, R)| - 1}{|S : Z(S, R)|}\right).$$

In particular, if $Z(S, R) \neq S$ then $\Pr(S, R) > \frac{1}{|K(S,R)|}$.

Proof. By (2.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(S, R) =& \frac{1}{|S|}\sum_{s \in S}\frac{1}{|R : C_R(s)|} \\ =& \frac{|Z(S, R)|}{|S|} + \frac{1}{|S|}\sum_{s \in S - Z(S, R)}\frac{1}{|R : C_R(s)|}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, by (2.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr(S, R) \geq& \frac{|Z(S, R)|}{|S|} + \frac{1}{|S|}\sum_{s \in S - Z(S,R)}\frac{1}{|K(S, R)|} \\ =& \frac{|Z(S, R)|}{|S|} + \frac{|S| - |Z(S, R)|}{|S||K(S, R)|}\end{aligned}$$

from which the result follows. □

Since $|[S,R]| \geq |R : C_R(s)|$ for all $s \in S$, we also have the following lower bound.

Theorem 2.17. *Let S be a subring of a finite ring R. Then*

$$\Pr(S,R) \geq \frac{1}{|[S,R]|}\left(1 + \frac{|[S,R]|-1}{|S : Z(S,R)|}\right).$$

In particular, if $Z(S,R) \neq S$ then $\Pr(S,R) > \frac{1}{|[S,R]|}$.

Let p be the smallest prime dividing $|R|$. If $[S,R] \neq R$ and $S \neq Z(S,R)$ then it can be seen that

$$\frac{1}{|[S,R]|}\left(1 + \frac{|[S,R]|-1}{|S : Z(S,R)|}\right) \geq \frac{|Z(S,R)|}{|S|} + \frac{p(|S| - |Z(S,R)|)}{|S||R|}$$

with equality if and only if $|R : [S : R]| = p$. Also,

$$\frac{1}{|K(S,R)|}\left(1 + \frac{|K(S,R)|-1}{|S : Z(S,R)|}\right) \geq \frac{1}{|[S,R]|}\left(1 + \frac{|[S,R]|-1}{|S : Z(S,R)|}\right)$$

with equality if and only if $K(S,R) = [S,R]$. Hence, the lower bound obtained in Theorem 2.16 is better than the lower bounds obtained in Corollary 2.6 and Theorem 2.17.

Putting $S = R$, in Theorem 2.16 and Theorem 2.17, we get the following corollaries.

Corollary 2.18. *If R is a finite ring then*

$$\Pr(R) \geq \frac{1}{|K(R,R)|}\left(1 + \frac{|K(R,R)|-1}{|R : Z(R)|}\right).$$

In particular, if R is non-commutative then $\Pr(R) > \frac{1}{|K(R,R)|}$.

Corollary 2.19. *If R is a finite ring then*

$$\Pr(R) \geq \frac{1}{|[R,R]|}\left(1 + \frac{|[R,R]|-1}{|R : Z(R)|}\right).$$

In particular, if R is non-commutative then $\Pr(R) > \frac{1}{|[R,R]|}$.

We conclude this section, noting that the lower bound for $\Pr(R)$ obtained in Corollary 2.18 is better than the lower bound obtained in Corollary 2.6 and Corollary 2.19. Further, the lower bound for $\Pr(R)$ obtained in Corollary 2.19 is an improvement of the lower bound obtained in Lemma 2.3 of [2]. Hence, the lower bound for $\Pr(R)$ obtained in Corollary 2.18 is better than the lower bound obtained in Lemma 2.3 of [2].

3 $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism of rings

Hall [8] introduced the notion of isoclinism between two groups and Lescot [9] showed that the commuting probability of two isoclinic finite groups are same. Later on Buckley, MacHale and Ní shé [2] introduced the concept of $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two rings and showed that the commuting probability of two isoclinic finite rings are same. In this section, we introduce the concept of $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of rings and show that relative commuting probability remains invariant under $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism of pairs of rings. The group theoretic analogous results can be found in [14].

Recall that two rings R_1 and R_2 are said to be $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic (see [2]) if there exist additive group isomorphisms $\phi : \frac{R_1}{Z(R_1)} \to \frac{R_2}{Z(R_2)}$ and $\psi : [R_1, R_1] \to [R_2, R_2]$ such that $\psi([u, v]) = [u', v']$ whenever $\phi(u+Z(R_1)) = u'+Z(R_2)$ and $\phi(v + Z(R_1)) = v' + Z(R_2)$. Equivalently, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{R_1}{Z(R_1)} \otimes \frac{R_1}{Z(R_1)} & \xrightarrow{\phi\otimes\phi} & \frac{R_2}{Z(R_2)} \otimes \frac{R_2}{Z(R_2)} \\ \downarrow a_{R_1} & & \downarrow a_{R_2} \\ [R_1, R_1] & \xrightarrow{\psi} & [R_2, R_2], \end{array}$$

where $\frac{R_i}{Z(R_i)} \otimes \frac{R_i}{Z(R_i)}$ denotes tensor product of $\frac{R_i}{Z(R_i)}$ with itself for $i = 1, 2$; $a_{R_i} : \frac{R_i}{Z(R_i)} \otimes \frac{R_i}{Z(R_i)} \to [R_i, R_i]$ are well defined maps given by

$$a_{R_i}((x_i + Z(R_i)) \otimes (y_i + Z(R_i))) = [x_i, y_i]$$

for all $x_i, y_i \in R_i$ and $i = 1, 2$; and

$$\phi \otimes \phi((x_1 + Z(R_1) \otimes (y_1 + Z(R_1)) = (x_2 + Z(R_2) \otimes (y_2 + Z(R_2)$$

whenever $\phi(x_1 + Z(R_1)) = x_2 + Z(R_2)$ and $\phi(y_1 + Z(R_1)) = y_2 + Z(R_2)$. The above diagram commutes means

$$a_{R_2} \circ (\phi \otimes \phi) = \psi \circ a_{R_1}.$$

The pair of mappings (ϕ, ψ) is called a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism from R_1 to R_2.

Following [14], we introduce the concept of $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of rings in the following definition.

Definition 3.1. *Let R_1 and R_2 be two rings with subrings S_1 and S_2 respectively. A pair of rings (S_1, R_1) is said to be $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic to a pair of rings (S_2, R_2) if there exist additive group isomorphisms $\phi : \frac{R_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} \to \frac{R_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$ such that $\phi\left(\frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)}\right) = \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$; and $\psi : [S_1, R_1] \to [S_2, R_2]$ such that $\psi([u, v]) = [u', v']$ whenever $\phi(u + Z(S_1, R_1)) = u' + Z(S_2, R_2)$ and $\phi(v + Z(S_1, R_1)) = v' + Z(S_2, R_2)$. Such pair of mappings (ϕ, ψ) is called a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between (S_1, R_1) and (S_2, R_2).*

Equivalently, a pair of rings (S_1, R_1) is said to be $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic to a pair of rings (S_2, R_2) if there exist additive group isomorphisms $\phi : \frac{R_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} \to \frac{R_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$ such that $\phi\left(\frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)}\right) = \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$ and $\psi : [S_1, R_1] \to [S_2, R_2]$ such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} \otimes \frac{R_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} & \xrightarrow{\phi\otimes\phi} & \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)} \otimes \frac{R_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)} \\ \downarrow a_{(S_1,R_1)} & & \downarrow a_{(S_2,R_2)} \\ [S_1, R_1] & \xrightarrow{\psi} & [S_2, R_2], \end{array}$$

where $\frac{S_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)} \otimes \frac{R_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)}$ denotes tensor product of $\frac{S_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)}$ with $\frac{R_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$; $a_{(S_i,R_i)} : \frac{S_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)} \otimes \frac{R_i}{Z(S_i,R_i)} \to [S_i, R_i]$ are well defined maps given by

$$a_{(S_i,R_i)}((x_i + Z(S_i, R_i)) \otimes (y_i + Z(S_i, R_i))) = [x_i, y_i]$$

for all $x_i \in S_i, y_i \in R_i$ and $i = 1, 2$; and

$$\phi\otimes\phi((x_1+Z(S_1, R_1))\otimes(y_1+Z(S_1, R_1))) = (x_2+Z(S_2, R_2))\otimes(y_2+Z(S_2, R_2))$$

whenever $\phi(x_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) = x_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)$ and $\phi(y_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) = y_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)$. The above diagram commutes means

$$a_{(S_2,R_2)} \circ (\phi \otimes \phi) = \psi \circ a_{(S_1,R_1)}.$$

For example, consider the non-commutative rings

$$R_1 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix} : a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_p \right\}, R_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} : x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_p \right\}$$

and their subrings $S_1 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a \end{bmatrix} : a \in \mathbb{Z}_p \right\}$, $S_2 = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$ respectively. Then $R_1/Z(S_1, R_1) \cong \mathbb{Z}_p \times \mathbb{Z}_p \cong R_2/Z(S_2, R_2)$ and $[S_1, R_1] \cong \{0\} \cong [S_2, R_2]$.

Also the above diagram commutes since $[S_1, R_1]$ and $[S_2, R_2]$ are trivial. Hence the pairs (S_1, R_1) and (S_2, R_2) are $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic. But the pairs $(\langle 4\rangle, \mathbb{Z}_8)$ and $(\langle 3\rangle, \mathbb{Z}_{12})$ are not $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinic since $\frac{\mathbb{Z}_8}{Z(\langle 4\rangle, \mathbb{Z}_8)} \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$ but $\frac{\mathbb{Z}_{12}}{Z(\langle 3\rangle, \mathbb{Z}_{12})} \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$.

The following lemma plays an important role in proving the invariance property of relative commuting probability under $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism between two pairs of rings.

Lemma 3.2. *Let R_1 and R_2 be two rings with subrings S_1 and S_2 respectively. If (ϕ, ψ) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism from (S_1, R_1) to (S_2, R_2) then $[s_1, R_1]$ and $[s_2, R_2]$ are isomorphic, whenever $s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2$ and $\phi(s_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) = s_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)$.*

Proof. If (ϕ, ψ) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism from (S_1, R_1) to (S_2, R_2) then $\phi : \frac{R_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} \to \frac{R_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$ and $\psi : [S_1, R_1] \to [S_2, R_2]$ are additive group isomorphisms such that $\phi\left(\frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)}\right) = \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$. Let $s_1 \in S_1$ and ψ' denote the restriction of ψ on $[s_1, R_1]$. Then ψ' is an injective homomorphism, since ψ is an isomorphism. Let $s_2 \in S_2$ such that $\phi(s_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) = s_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)$. We shall show that ψ' is the required isomorphism between $[s_1, R_1]$ and $[s_2, R_2]$. For this it is sufficient to show that ψ' is surjective. Let $[s_2, r_2] \in [s_2, R_2]$ for some $r_2 \in R_2$. Since $\phi : \frac{R_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)} \to \frac{R_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}$ is an isomorphism, there exists an element $r_1 \in R_1$ such that $\phi(r_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) = r_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)$. Since (ϕ, ψ) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi'([s_1, r_1]) =& \psi([s_1, r_1]) = \psi \circ a_{(S_1,R_1)}((s_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) \otimes (r_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)))\\ =& a_{(S_2,R_2)} \circ (\phi \otimes \phi)((s_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)) \otimes (r_1 + Z(S_1, R_1)))\\ =& a_{(S_2,R_2)}((s_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)) \otimes (r_2 + Z(S_2, R_2)))\\ =& [s_2, r_2].\end{aligned}$$

This shows that ψ' is surjective. Hence the lemma follows. □

Now, we prove the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3.3. *Let R_1 and R_2 be two rings with subrings S_1 and S_2 respectively. If (ϕ, ψ) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism from (S_1, R_1) to (S_2, R_2) then*

$$\Pr(S_1, R_1) = \Pr(S_2, R_2).$$

Proof. By (2.1) and Lemma 2.15, we have

$$\Pr(S_1, R_1) = \frac{1}{|S_1 : Z(S_1, R_1)|} \sum_{s_1 + Z(S_1,R_1) \in \frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)}} \frac{1}{|[s_1, R_1]|}$$

and

$$\Pr(S_2, R_2) = \frac{1}{|S_2 : Z(S_2, R_2)|} \sum_{s_2 + Z(S_2,R_2) \in \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}} \frac{1}{|[s_2, R_2]|}.$$

If (ϕ, ψ) is a $\mathbb{Z}$-isoclinism from (S_1, R_1) to (S_2, R_2) then $|S_1 : Z(S_1, R_1)| = |S_2 : Z(S_2, R_2)|$. Also, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\sum_{s_1 + Z(S_1,R_1) \in \frac{S_1}{Z(S_1,R_1)}} \frac{1}{|[s_1, R_1]|} = \sum_{s_2 + Z(S_2,R_2) \in \frac{S_2}{Z(S_2,R_2)}} \frac{1}{|[s_2, R_2]|}.$$

Hence the theorem follows. □

References

[1] S. M. Buckley and D. Machale, *Contrasting the commuting probabilities of groups and rings*, Preprint.

[2] S. M. Buckley, D. Machale, and A. Ní Shé, *Finite rings with many commuting pairs of elements*, Preprint.

[3] A. K. Das and R. K. Nath, *A characterization of certain finite groups of odd order*, Math. Proc. Royal Irish Acad., **III** A2 (2011), 69–78.

[4] A. K. Das and R. K. Nath, *On generalized relative commutativity degree of a finite group*, Int. Electronic. J. Algebra, **7**(2010), 140–151.

[5] P. Erdös and P. Turán, *On some problems of a statistical group-theory. IV*, Acta. Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. **19** (1968), 413–435.

[6] A. Erfanian, R. Rezaei and P. Lescot, *On the relative commutativity of a subgroup of a finite group*, Comm. Algebra, **35** (2007), 4183–4197.

[7] R. M. Guralnick and G. R. Robinson, *On the commuting probability in finite groups*, J. Algebra, **300**(2)(2006), 509–528.

[8] P. Hall, *The classification of prime power groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **182** (1940), 130–141.

[9] P. Lescot, *Isoclinism classes and commutativity degrees of finite groups*, J. Algebra, **177** (1995), 847–869.

[10] P. Lescot, *Central extensions and commutativity degree*, Comm. Algebra, **29** (10) (2001), 4451–4460.

[11] D. MacHale, *Commutativity in finite rings*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **83**(1976), 30–32.

[12] D. MacHale, *How commutative can a non-commutative group be?* Math. Gazette, **LVIII**(1974), 199–202.

[13] R. K. Nath and A. K. Das, *On a lower bound of commutativity degree*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, **59**(2010), 137–142.

[14] R. K. Nath and M. K. Yadav, *Some results on relative commutativity degree*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, DOI 10.1007/s12215-015-0194-x.

[15] D. J. Rusin, *What is the probability that two elements of a finite group commute?*, Pacific J. Math., **82** (1979), 237–247.

[16] A. R. Salemkar, F. Saeedi and T. Karimi, *The structures of isoclinism classes of pair of groups*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math., **31**(2007), 1173–1181.

[17] A. R. Salemkar, H. Tavallaee and H. Mohammadzadeh, *A remark on the commuting probability in finite groups*, Southeast Asian Bull. Math. **34**(2010), 755–763.